

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration of the objection to the drawings as well as the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, set forth by the Examiner.

Applicant notes that the subject matter of claim 2 is directed to the embodiment of the invention described with reference to Figures 9A and 9B, wherein the coil member has portions with an air gap between the coil and the polyimide layer. More specifically, as noted in the Specification in last paragraph on page 18, the spiral-shaped coil 18 is embedded in the surface of the polyimide layer 20 as whole, and most of it is structured as an aerial wire separated from the polyimide layer 20.

As further described in the preceding paragraph, the spiral-shaped coil is supported by the polyimide layer 20 in an area that is sandwiched between two semispherical recesses 28A and 28B. The bottom and the side surface of the spiral-shaped coil 18 are coated and held by the polyimide layer 20 only in the area sandwiched between the two semispherical recesses.

Figures 9A and 9B clearly demonstrate the subject matter described in the reference portions of the specification as well as the claims which are consistent with that description.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings and the rejections under §112.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103. Applicant submits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest

Applicants presently claimed invention. More specifically, as noted above, Applicants claimed invention is directed to a coil member formed on an insulating body wherein portions of the coil are separated by an air gap from the adjacent insulating body and portions are directly supported by the insulating body. The prior art references of record provide no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding this advance in the art. In particular, Applicant notes that the *Li* reference, United States Patent No. 5,477,204 provides no teaching or suggestion regarding a coil structure formed in the substrate wherein portions of the coil are covered by the substrate and other portions having a gap between a bottom surface of the coil and a substrate.

In contrast with the assertions of the Examiner, the actual structure and the only embodiment described in the Specification of the prior art is directed to a transformer 100 having a flat substrate 101 and having a dielectric constant that is higher than air. See specifically column 1 at lines 55-60. As noted therein, the high dielectric constant of the substrate is highly desirable in order to reduce the size of the transformer. Accordingly, this reference actually teaches away from the subject matter of the instant invention employing an air gap. There is simply no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding portions having an air gap. It appears that the plating of this structure referenced in the drawing may have caused confusion, but the plating is actually on an opposite side from the coil runners 124 and 126. There is just no air gap whatsoever.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant requests that the Examiner with the rejections and allow all claims in the application.

Appl. No. 10/675,659
Amdt. Dated October 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/13/04


(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC
131 S. Dearborn, 30th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Tel: (312) 263-3600
Attorney for Applicant

Appl. No. 10/675,659
Amdt. Dated October 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2004



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as First Class Mail on 10/13/04 in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**


Attorney for Applicants